UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/892,817	06/26/2001	Asko Komsi	NC30576	3499

29683 7590 11/03/2004

HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 RESEARCH DRIVE
SHELTON, CT 06484-6212

EXAMINER	
VU, THANH T	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/892,817	KOMSI ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thanh T. Vu	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 June 2004*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-14* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the Amendment, Filed 06/03/2004.

Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. In the Amendment, claims 5-14 were added, and claims 1-4 were amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liles et al. ("Liles", U.S. Pat. No. 5,880,731) and Dupouy (U.S. Pat. No. 6,057,845).

Per claim 1, Liles teaches a system for entity visualization of text messages, comprising:

an entity that comprises a media pool and a body comprising a plurality of predefined entity commands (fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32), but does not teach an entity player for invoking the entity commands; means for receiving text input; and means for associating the text input with at least one entity command, wherein the entity command is invoked using the text input.

However Dupouy teaches a method comprising an entity player for invoking the entity commands (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67); means for receiving text input (figs. 4d and 6b; col. 5, lines 2-5; col. 7, lines 11-15); and means for associating the text input with at least one entity command,

wherein the entity command is invoked using the text input (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Dupouy in the invention of Liles because it provides users with universal command generator using an improved method of converting a user input into commands that are recognizable by application or device.

Per claim 2, Liles teaches the method for entity visualization of text messages, comprising:

providing an entity that comprises a media pool and a body, the body comprising a plurality of entity commands (fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32), but does not teach the method comprising receiving a text input; associating the text input with at least one entity command; and invoking the entity command.

However, Dupouy teaches the method comprising receiving a text input (figs. 4d and 6b; col. 5, lines 2-5; col. 7, lines 11-15); associating the text input with at least one entity command (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67); and invoking the entity command (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Dupouy in the invention of Liles because it provides users with universal command generator using an improved method of converting a user input into commands that are recognizable by application or device.

Per claim 3, Liles for entity visualization of text messages, comprising: providing and an entity that comprises a media pool and body, the body comprising a plurality of entity commands (fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32), but does not teach receiving a text input; comparing the text input to a plurality of entity commands; determining whether the text input includes at least one matching entity commands; executing the entity command of a match is found; and constructing a message from the text input if a match is not found.

Dupouy teaches a method comprising: receiving a text input; comparing the text input to a plurality of entity commands (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67);

determining whether the text input includes at least one matching entity commands (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67);

executing the entity command of a match is found (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67); and

constructing a message from the text input if a match is not found (col. 8, lines 35-39 and lines 63-65; col. 9, lines 12-14).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Dupouy in the invention of Liles because it provides users with universal command generator using an improved method of converting a user input into commands that are recognizable by application or device.

Per claim 4, Liles teaches a method for entity visualization of text messages, comprising: receiving by an entity-enable device, a text input string, where an entity comprises a media pool and a body, the body comprising a plurality of entity commands (fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32), but does not teach the method comprising: parsing the text input string to determine if the text input string includes an entity command; invoking an entity action associated with the entity command if the text input string includes an entity command; and invoking at least one default action of the text input string does not include an entity command.

However, Dupouy teaches a method comprising: receiving, by an entity-enabled device, a text input string (figs. 4d and 6b; col. 5, lines 2-5; col. 7, lines 11-15); parsing the text input string to determine if the text input string includes an entity command (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67); invoking an entity action associated with the entity command if the text input string includes an entity command (figs. 2 and 4a; col. 5, lines 5-12; col. 7, lines 52-56; col. 8, lines 34-35 and lines 55-63; col. 9, lines 1-12; col. 11, lines 53-67); and invoking at least one default action of the text input string does not include an entity command (col. 8, lines 35-39 and lines 63-65; col. 9, lines 12-14);

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the method as taught by Dupouy in the invention of Liles because it provides users with universal command generator using an improved method of converting a user input into commands that are recognizable by application or device.

Claims 5-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Liles et al. ("Liles", U.S. Pat. No. 5,880,731) and Isaacs et al. ("Isaacs", Pub. No. US 2002/0026483).

Per claim 5, Liles teaches an entity enabled communications device for displaying a text message to a user of the communications device, comprising at least one logical unit that is responsive to a receipt of a text string (col. 5, lines 25-42; col. 6, lines 35-49), where the text string comprises first text for specifying an entity command and second text for specifying a text message, to execute the entity command by displaying on a display of the communications device a visual representation of an entity having at least one characteristic that corresponds to the entity command (col. 10, lines 1-32), and further displaying the text message in conjunction with the displayed visual representation of the entity, where the entity comprises at least a media pool component and a body component (fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32). Liles does not teach the communication device is a wireless communication device.

However, Isaacs teaches a wireless communication device (fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the wireless device as taught by Isaacs in the invention of Liles in order to provide user with remote access to information.

Claim 6 is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Per claim 7, Liles teaches a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 6, where said player, when causing the display of the visual representation of the entity having the at least one characteristic that corresponds to the entity command, causes the display of an animation (col. 7, lines 48-65; col. 8, lines 56-67).

Per claim 8, Liles teaches a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 7, where said player, when causing the display of the animation, causes the displayed animation to at least one of move in a manner consistent with the entity command, and exhibit a facial expression that is consistent with the entity command (col. 7, lines 48-65; col. 8, lines 56-67).

Per claim 9, Liles and Issacs teach multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 6, where said multi-component logical entity and said player are embodied within a wireless communications terminal (Liles, fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32, and Isaacs, fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]).

Per claim 10, Liles and Issacs teach a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 6, where said player is embodied within a component of a wireless network and invokes the entity on behalf of a wireless communications terminal (Issacs, fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]).

Per claim 11, Liles and Issacs teach a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 10, where a user of the wireless communications terminal views a result of the execution of the entity using an entity enabled device (Liles, fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32, and Issacs, fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]).

Per claim 12, Liles and Issacs teach a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 10, where a user of the wireless communications terminal views a result of the execution of the entity with a computer that is coupled to the player through at least one of a wireless and a wireline connection (Liles, fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32, and Issacs, fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]).

Per claim 13, Liles and Issacs teach a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 6, where said entity is received over a wireless communications channel as part of a message (Liles, fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32, and Issacs, fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]).

Per claim 14, Liles and Issacs teach teaches a multi-component logical entity storable in a memory medium as in claim 6, where said entity is transmitted to a wireless communications channel as part of a message (Liles, fig. 3-5 and 6-8; col. 7, lines 18-42 and lines 48-65; col. 10, lines 1-32, and Issacs, fig. 1; [0026]; [0027]).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 8:30 AM - 6:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100